

REMARKS

The claims were amended in accordance with the marked-up amendments, above. The amendments are being made to clarify. The amendments are fully supported by the specification, claims, and figures as originally filed. No new matter is believed or intended to be involved.

Applicants and the undersigned attorney appreciate the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview on October 20, 2005. While no agreement was reached during that interview, the Examiner indicated the present amendment distinguished over the prior art of record. While the Examiner reserved the right to conduct a further prior art search, applicants believe that the claims as presently amended are allowable.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 7-15, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nielsen (US 5,826,031). Applicants traverse the rejection because numerous elements recited in the pending claims are not taught or suggested in Nielson.

Regarding Claim 1, the Office Action stated that column 7, lines 10-26 discloses the limitation of “encoding an embedded navigation link.” Final Office Action at 3. Applicants note that the cited section of Nielsen reads as follows:

After all cached web objects have been retrieved, the browser invokes steps to retrieve web objects stored on a remote server (step 611). FIG. 7, which is described in more detail below, illustrates the preferred steps for retrieving remotely stored web objects. In step 701, the browser builds a list of all embedded objects in the web file that were not found in the cache. The objects are preferably numbered according to their sequential appearance in the web file (e.g., the first object is object 1, the second object is object 2, etc.). If the object is referenced multiple times, it is preferably assigned the sequence number of its first reference in the file. Any object that does not have a PRIORITY attribute is preferably assigned a priority of zero.

The current version of that Claim 1 is set forth below, with amendments presented in strikethrough and underline format for convenience.

A method for operating a browser associated with an end-user, the method comprising:

retrieving content from a content provider that corresponds to a navigation location, wherein the retrieved content includes an embedded navigation link;

encoding the embedded navigation link into a new link;

replacing the embedded navigation link included in the retrieved content with the encoding of the embedded navigation link; and

providing modified content to the end-user, wherein the modified content includes at least a portion of the retrieved content and includes the encoding of the embedded navigation link that replaced the embedded navigation link.

Applicants respectfully submit that, as discussed in the telephone interview of October 20, the current amendment to Claim 1 clarifies the distinction between “encoding” in the present invention and the teaching of the prior art, and therefore overcomes the rejection of that claim as anticipated by Nielsen under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Thus, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected Claims 5, 11, and 15 under the same reasoning as Claim 1.

Applicants note that Claims 5, 11, and 15 has been amended in a similar manner as Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 5, 11, and 15 are allowable for the same reasons as Claim 1. Thus, applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 5, 11, and 15 be withdrawn.

Applicants additionally note that Claim 15 has been amended to correct a minor clerical error. That amendment is not believed or intended to change the scope of Claim 15.

Regarding Claims 2-4, applicants note that those claims all depend on Claim 1. Applicants assert that, since those claims contain each novel limitation of Claim 1 by virtue of depending on that claim, the rejections of Claims 2-4 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons presented above with respect to Claim 1. Applicants further assert that those dependent claims contain further novel limitations which provide independent basis for patentability.

Therefore applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 2-4 as being anticipated by Nielsen under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 7-10, applicants note that those claims all depend on Claim 5. Applicants assert that, since those claims contain each novel limitation of Claim 5 by virtue of depending on that claim, the rejections of Claims 7-10 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons presented above with respect to Claim 5. Applicants further assert that those dependent claims contain further novel limitations which provide independent basis for patentability. Therefore applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 7-10 as being anticipated by Nielsen under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 12-14, applicants note that those claims all depend on Claim 11. Applicants assert that, since those claims contain each novel limitation of Claim 11 by virtue of depending on that claim, the rejections of Claims 12-14 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons presented above with respect to Claim 11. Applicants further assert that those dependent claims contain further novel limitations which provide independent basis for patentability. Therefore applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 12-14 as being anticipated by Nielsen under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 17-19, applicants note that those claims all depend on Claim 15. Applicants assert that, since those claims contain each novel limitation of Claim 15 by virtue of depending on that claim, the rejections of Claims 17-19 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons presented above with respect to Claim 15. Applicants further assert that those dependent claims contain further novel limitations which provide independent basis for patentability. Therefore applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 17-19 as being anticipated by Nielsen under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Based on the foregoing, all claims should be in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant traverses all rejections in the Office Action and respectfully requests reconsideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Victor C. Moreno (Reg. No. 40,732)  
FROST BROWN TODD LLC  
2200 PNC Center  
201 East Fifth Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
(513) 651-6812

Certificate of Mailing

The undersigned certifies that this correspondence was deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed to "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on October 25, 2005.

